

## Relapse Prevention Therapy

### Substance Abuse: Substance Abuse Treatment for Adults

Benefit-cost estimates updated December 2016. Literature review updated May 2014.

Current estimates replace old estimates. Numbers will change over time as a result of model inputs and monetization methods.

The WSIPP benefit-cost analysis examines, on an apples-to-apples basis, the monetary value of programs or policies to determine whether the benefits from the program exceed its costs. WSIPP's research approach to identifying evidence-based programs and policies has three main steps. First, we determine "what works" (and what does not work) to improve outcomes using a statistical technique called meta-analysis. Second, we calculate whether the benefits of a program exceed its costs. Third, we estimate the risk of investing in a program by testing the sensitivity of our results. For more detail on our methods, see our [Technical Documentation](#).

**Program Description:** This intervention, developed by Marlatt & Gordon, uses a cognitive-behavioral approach to help patients anticipate problems and identify strategies to avoid using alcohol and drugs. Typically patients are receiving outpatient treatment; sometimes Relapse Prevention is part of aftercare following inpatient treatment and sometimes as a stand-alone intervention. In the studies used in this meta-analysis, the intervention was delivered in various modalities. In some of the studies all sessions were individual treatment, others studies examined a mix of group and individual treatment. Duration varied from eight sessions in four weeks to weekly sessions for several months.

#### Benefit-Cost Summary Statistics Per Participant

##### Benefits to:

Taxpayers	\$1,156	Benefit to cost ratio	n/a
Participants	\$2,366	Benefits minus costs	\$3,982
Others	\$90	Chance the program will produce	
Indirect	\$370	benefits greater than the costs	58 %
<u>Total benefits</u>	<u>\$3,982</u>		
<u>Net program cost</u>	<u>\$0</u>		
Benefits minus cost	\$3,982		

The estimates shown are present value, life cycle benefits and costs. All dollars are expressed in the base year chosen for this analysis (2015). The chance the benefits exceed the costs are derived from a Monte Carlo risk analysis. The details on this, as well as the economic discount rates and other relevant parameters are described in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Detailed Monetary Benefit Estimates Per Participant

Benefits from changes to: <sup>1</sup>	Benefits to:				
	Participants	Taxpayers	Others <sup>2</sup>	Indirect <sup>3</sup>	Total
Crime	\$0	\$0	\$1	\$0	\$2
Labor market earnings associated with alcohol abuse or dependence	\$2,346	\$1,065	\$0	\$326	\$3,737
Property loss associated with alcohol abuse or dependence	\$4	\$0	\$7	\$0	\$10
Health care associated with illicit drug abuse or dependence	\$16	\$90	\$82	\$44	\$232
Totals	\$2,366	\$1,156	\$90	\$370	\$3,982

<sup>1</sup>In addition to the outcomes measured in the meta-analysis table, WSIPP measures benefits and costs estimated from other outcomes associated with those reported in the evaluation literature. For example, empirical research demonstrates that high school graduation leads to reduced crime. These associated measures provide a more complete picture of the detailed costs and benefits of the program.

<sup>2</sup>"Others" includes benefits to people other than taxpayers and participants. Depending on the program, it could include reductions in crime victimization, the economic benefits from a more educated workforce, and the benefits from employer-paid health insurance.

<sup>3</sup>"Indirect benefits" includes estimates of the net changes in the value of a statistical life and net changes in the deadweight costs of taxation.


## Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant

	Annual cost	Year dollars	Summary	
Program costs	\$1,050	2014	Present value of net program costs (in 2015 dollars)	\$0
Comparison costs	\$1,050	2014	Cost range (+ or -)	15 %

This treatment varies in length, from four weeks to several months. We calculated a weighted average per-participant cost based on hours of individual and group counseling reported in the studies, assuming reimbursement at Washington's 2014 Medicaid rates.

The figures shown are estimates of the costs to implement programs in Washington. The comparison group costs reflect either no treatment or treatment as usual, depending on how effect sizes were calculated in the meta-analysis. The cost range reported above reflects potential variation or uncertainty in the cost estimate; more detail can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Detailed Annual Cost Estimates Per Participant



The graph above illustrates the estimated cumulative net benefits per-participant for the first fifty years beyond the initial investment in the program. We present these cash flows in non-discounted dollars to simplify the “break-even” point from a budgeting perspective. If the dollars are negative (bars below \$0 line), the cumulative benefits do not outweigh the cost of the program up to that point in time. The program breaks even when the dollars reach \$0. At this point, the total benefits to participants, taxpayers, and others, are equal to the cost of the program. If the dollars are above \$0, the benefits of the program exceed the initial investment.

Meta-Analysis of Program Effects										
Outcomes measured	No. of effect sizes	Treatment N	Adjusted effect sizes and standard errors used in the benefit-cost analysis						Unadjusted effect size (random effects model)	
			First time ES is estimated			Second time ES is estimated				
			ES	SE	Age	ES	SE	Age	ES	p-value
Alcohol abuse or dependence	4	156	-0.234	0.153	41	-0.003	0.178	42	-0.234	0.126
Illicit drug abuse or dependence	3	118	-0.217	0.288	41	-0.003	0.178	42	-0.217	0.577
Opioid drug abuse or dependence	1	13	-1.340	0.575	41	-0.003	0.178	42	-1.340	0.020
Cannabis abuse or dependence	1	80	-0.130	0.248	41	-0.003	0.178	42	-0.103	0.677

Meta-analysis is a statistical method to combine the results from separate studies on a program, policy, or topic in order to estimate its effect on an outcome. WSIPP systematically evaluates all credible evaluations we can locate on each topic. The outcomes measured are the types of program impacts that were measured in the research literature (for example, crime or educational attainment). Treatment N represents the total number of individuals or units in the treatment group across the included studies.

An effect size (ES) is a standard metric that summarizes the degree to which a program or policy affects a measured outcome. If the effect size is positive, the outcome increases. If the effect size is negative, the outcome decreases.

Adjusted effect sizes are used to calculate the benefits from our benefit cost model. WSIPP may adjust effect sizes based on methodological characteristics of the study. For example, we may adjust effect sizes when a study has a weak research design or when the program developer is involved in the research. The magnitude of these adjustments varies depending on the topic area.

WSIPP may also adjust the second ES measurement. Research shows the magnitude of some effect sizes decrease over time. For those effect sizes, we estimate outcome-based adjustments which we apply between the first time ES is estimated and the second time ES is estimated. We also report the unadjusted effect size to show the effect sizes before any adjustments have been made. More details about these adjustments can be found in our [Technical Documentation](#).

## Citations Used in the Meta-Analysis

Allsop, S., Saunders, B., Phillips, M., & Carr, A. (1997). A trial of relapse prevention with severely dependent male problem drinkers. *Addiction*, 92, 61-74.

Bennett, G.A., Withers, J., Thomas, P.W., Higgins, D.S., Bailey, J., Parry, L., & Davies, E. (2005). A randomised trial of early warning signs relapse prevention training in the treatment of alcohol dependence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 30(6), 1111-1124.

Jafari, E., Eskandari, H., Sohrabi, F., Delavar, A., Heshmati, R., & World Conference on Psychology, Counselling and Guidance, WPCPG-2010. (2010). Effectiveness of coping skills training in relapse prevention and resiliency enhancement in people with substance dependency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 1376-1380.

McKay, J.R., Alterman, A.I., Cacciola, J.S., O'Brien, C.P., Koppenhaver, J.M., & Shepard, D.S. (1999). Continuing care for cocaine dependence: Comprehensive 2-year outcomes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(3), 420-427.

O'Connell, J.M. (1987). *Effectiveness of an alcohol relapse prevention program*. (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1987, UMI No. 8725685).

Wells, E.A., Peterson, P.L., Gainey, R.R., Hawkins, J.D. & Catalano, R.F. (1994). Outpatient treatment for cocaine abuse: A controlled comparison of relapse prevention and twelve-step approaches. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 20(1), 1-17.



## Washington State Institute for Public Policy

The Washington State Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors-representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities-governs WSIPP and guides the development of all activities. WSIPP's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State.